

## **REMARKS**

The Final Office Action mailed December 24, 2009 has been reviewed and these remarks are responsive thereto. Claims 1-24, 26-38, and 41 have been examined. Claims 1-24 and 26-37 currently stand rejected. Claims 38 and 41 are allowed. Claims 1-7, 9-15, 17-24, 26-28, 30, 31-36, 38 and 41 have been amended to clarify the subject matter of the claims. No new matter is added.

### **I. Claim Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)**

#### **A. Claims 1-8**

The Office Action rejects claims 1-8 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being obvious over U.S. Patent No. 7,480,861 to Yalovsky (hereinafter “Yalovsky”). For at least the following reasons, Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection of claims 1-8 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a).

Among other elements, claim 1 recites “determining, by one or more computing devices, a first set of local format attributes, the first set of format attributes indicating local formatting of a first region of the electronic document.” Claim 1 also recites “wherein selected content is a subset of content in the first region.” In addition, claim 1 recites “the content in the first region being a subset of the content in the electronic document.” Claim 1 also recites “local formatting of another region of the electronic document is different than the local formatting of the first region.”

Yalovsky does not teach these elements of claim 1. Claim 1 indicates that the selected content is a subset of the content in the first region. Hence, the first region includes content other than the selected content. Furthermore, claim 1 indicates that the content in the first region is a subset of the content in the document. Hence, the document includes content other than the first region. To illustrate this point, Applicant’s specification provides, as one non-limiting example, that the first “region may be a paragraph that contains the selected content or may include multiple paragraphs in either direction of the selected content.”

In addition, claim 1 indicates that the first set of format attributes indicates local formatting of the first region. Applicants’ specification explains that “local formatting

corresponds to the general formatting attributes of the content of the local document at either a source location, that is, the location of the selected and cut or copied content, or a destination location, that is, a location where the cut or copied content is pasted.” Applicants’ specification, page 12, lines 16-19. Claim 1 further indicates that the local formatting of another region of the electronic document is different than the local formatting of the first region. As described in one non-limiting example in Applicants’ specification “local formatting at the source location may have a font face of Arial, a font size of 10 point, and a color of black. The destination location may have a font size of Times New Roman, a font size of 10 point and a color of black and be italicized.” Applicants’ specification, page 13, lines 22-25.

Yalovsky discusses “general formatting” and “direct formatting.” Yalovsky defines “general formatting” as “formatting that is applied widely to much of the content of the source document.” Yalovsky, column 4, lines 8-9. Yalovsky defines “direct formatting” as “deviations from the general formatting that have been applied on a case-by-case basis, typically by the user.” Yalovsky, column 4, lines 26-29. Even if one were to assume that the “general formatting” of Yalovsky taught the “local formatting” of claim 1, there is nothing in Yalovsky to suggest that the “general formatting” indicates local formatting of only a subset of the content in the electronic document. Furthermore, there is nothing in Yalovsky to suggest that the “general formatting” indicates local formatting of a first region of an electronic document where local formatting for another region of the same electronic document is different than the local formatting for the first region. In other words, the general formatting for the first region of the electronic document is not the same as the general formatting for the other region of the electronic document. Hence, the general formatting for the “first region” of claim 1 is not necessarily widely applied to the entire electronic document. In contrast, Yalovsky explains that the “general formatting” is widely applied to much of the document. Hence, determining the “general formatting” of Yalovsky does not teach determining the local formatting of the “first region” of the electronic document.

For at least these reasons, Yalovsky does not teach or suggest all elements of claim 1. Because Yalovsky does not teach or suggest all elements of claim 1, claim 1 is not obvious over 1 is not obvious over Yalovsky. Claims 2-8 depend from claim 1. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request the withdrawal of the rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) of claims 1-8.

**B. Claims 9-16**

The Office Action rejects claims 9-16 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being obvious over Yalovsky. For at least the following reasons, Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection of claims 9-16 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a).

Among other elements, claim 9 recites “a format module that, when executed by the processing unit, is operable to determine a first set of format attributes, the first set of format attributes indicating local formatting of a first region of the electronic document, wherein the selected content is a subset of content in the first region, wherein the content in the first region is a subset of the content of the electronic document.” In addition, claim 9 recites “the format module, when executed by the processing unit, further operable to determine a second set of format attributes, the second set of format attributes indicating local formatting of a second region of the electronic document, wherein local formatting of the second region is different than the local formatting of the first region.”

Although these elements of claim 9 are not identical to the elements of claim 1 discussed above, the reasoning above with regard to claim 1 demonstrates that Yalovsky does not teach or suggest these elements of claim 9. Claims 10-16 depend from claim 9. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request the withdrawal of the rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) of claims 9-16.

**C. Claims 17-22**

The Office Action rejects claims 17-22 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being obvious over Yalovsky. For at least the following reasons, Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection of claims 17-22 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a).

Among other elements, claim 17 recites “determining, by one or more computing devices, a set of format attributes indicating local formatting of a region of content of the

electronic document, wherein the region of content comprises selected content, the selected content being a subset of the content in the region, the content in the region being a subset of the content in the electronic document, the selected content being a portion of content to be placed in another location of the electronic document, wherein local formatting of another region of the electronic document is different than the local formatting of the region.” Although these elements of claim 17 are not identical to the element of claim 1 discussed above, the reasoning provided above with regard to claim 1 demonstrates that Yalovsky fails to teach these elements of claim 17. Claims 18-22 depend from claim 17. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request the withdrawal of the rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) of claims 17-22.

**D. Claims 23, 24, and 26-29**

The Office Action rejects claims 23, 24, and 26-29 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being obvious over Yalovsky. For at least the following reasons, Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection of claims 23, 24, and 26-29 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a).

Among other elements, claim 23 recites “determining, by one or more computing devices, a first set of format attributes, the first set of format attributes indicating local formatting of a first region of content of the electronic document, wherein the first region of content comprises selected content to be copied, the selected content being a subset of the content in the first region, the content of the first region being a subset of the content in the electronic document, local formatting of another region of content of the electronic document being different than the local formatting of the first region.” Although these element of claim 23 are not identical to the elements of claim 1 discussed above, the reasoning above with regard to claim 1 demonstrates that Yalovsky does not teach or suggest these elements of claim 23. Claims 24 and 26-29 depend from claim 23. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request the withdrawal of the rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) of claims 23, 24, and 26-29.

**E. Claims 30-37**

The current Office Action rejects claims 30-37 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being obvious over Yalovsky. For at least the following reasons, Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection of claims 30-37 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a).

Among other elements, claim 30 recites “determining, by one or more computing devices, a first set of format attributes, the first set of format attributes indicating local formatting of a first region of content for the first electronic document, wherein content in the first region is a subset of content of the first electronic document, wherein the first region comprises selected content, the selected content being a subset of the content of the first region.” Although these elements of claim 30 are not identical to the elements of claim 1 discussed above, the reasoning above with regard to claim 1 demonstrates that Yalovsky does not teach or suggest these elements of claim 30. Claims 31-37 depend from claim 30. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request the withdrawal of the rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) of claims 30-37.

**II. Allowable Subject Matter**

The current Office Action indicated that claims 38 and 41 in condition for allowance.

**CONCLUSION**

In view of the foregoing remarks, Applicants respectfully submit that the claimed invention is neither anticipated nor rendered obvious in view of the prior art references cited against this application. Applicants therefore request the entry of this Amendment, the Examiner’s reconsideration and reexamination of the application, and the timely allowance of the pending claims. The Examiner is encouraged to contact the undersigned with any questions regarding this application.

The Office Action may contain arguments and rejections that are not directly addressed by this Amendment and Response because they are rendered moot in light of the preceding arguments in favor of patentability. Hence, failure of this Amendment and Response to directly address an argument raised in the Office Action should not be taken as an indication that the Applicants believe the argument has merit. Furthermore, the claims of the present application

may include other elements, not discussed in this Amendment, which are not shown, taught, or otherwise suggested by the references of record. Accordingly, the preceding arguments in favor of patentability are advanced without prejudice to other bases of patentability.

The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any additional fees as set forth in §§ 38 CFR 1.16 to 1.18 which may be required for entry of these papers or to credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 13-2725.

Respectfully submitted,  
MERCHANT & GOULD P.C.  
P.O. Box 2903  
Minneapolis, Minnesota 55402-0903  
(612) 332-5300

Date: March 10, 2010

/Albert W. Vredevelde/  
Name: Albert W. Vredevelde  
Reg. No.: 60,315